

MINUTES

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Also Meeting As STATE BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Alpena-Montmorency-Alcona
Educational Service District
2118 U.S. 23 South
Alpena, Michigan 49707

September 21, 2000
10:30 a.m.

Present: Mr. Arthur E. Ellis, Chairman
Mrs. Dorothy Beardmore, President
Mrs. Kathleen N. Straus, Vice President
Dr. Herbert S. Moyer, Secretary
Mrs. Sharon A. Wise, Treasurer
Mrs. Sharon L. Gire, NASBE Delegate
Mrs. Marianne Yared McGuire
Mr. Michael David Warren, Jr.
Mrs. Eileen Weiser
Mr. Scott Jenkins, representing Governor John Engler, ex officio

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Ellis called the meeting to order at 10:59 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND ORDER OF PRIORITY

- A. Approval of Criteria for the Selection of Demonstration Sites for Early Intervention/Early Childhood Practices Under Parts B and C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act - added to agenda
- B. Report of the Superintendent - 1999-2000 Goals 2000 Cycle 9/Category Three - added to the agenda

Mrs. Wise moved, seconded by Mr. Warren, that the State Board of Education approve the agenda and order of priority, as modified.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

III. AGENDA MATERIALS

- A. Michigan Department of Education Search for Superintendent of Public Instruction - Related to Discussion Regarding Process for Selection of Superintendent of Public Instruction
- B. Model Annual Calendar for Policy Making - Related to Discussion Regarding Policymaking Role of State Board of Education
- C. Exhibit A - Resolution Honoring Joan E. Garretson - Related to Approval of State Board of Education Minutes/Actions of Meeting of August 24, 2000
- D. Report on Consent Agenda

IV. INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS PROVIDED TO THE BOARD

- A. Information Regarding State School Aid for 1999-2000, 2001-02 and 2002-03, Public Act 297 of 2000
- B. Update on Activities at Michigan Schools for the Deaf and Blind, Camp T, and the Lansing Campus - Memorandum dated September 21, 2000, from Mr. Alexander Davlantes, Administrative Officer, to the State Board of Education

V. INTRODUCTION OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND GUESTS

Mrs. Eileen Hamilton, Administrative Secretary to the State Board of Education, introduced the State Board of Education and guests attending the meeting.

Mrs. Hamilton thanked Alpena Public Schools, and the Alpena-Montmorency-Alcona Educational Service District (AMA-ESD) for hosting the State Board of Education meeting. She also acknowledged Mr. Thomas Lanway, Superintendent, AMA ESD; and Mr. Thomas Harmon, Superintendent, Alpena Public Schools, Ms. Donna Meyer, Executive Secretary, AMA-ESD; and Ms. Carol Beatty, Administration Assistant to the Superintendent, Alpena Public Schools, who were instrumental in organizing the Board's visit and meeting.

VI. APPROVAL OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MINUTES AND RECEIPT OF
ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS/MINUTES

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mrs. Beardmore, that the State Board of Education approve the minutes/actions of August 24, 2000.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

VII. DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING PROCESS FOR SELECTION OF
SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Mr. Ellis introduced Mr. Lee Pasquerella, President, Cascade Consulting Group, Inc., who is on contract to conduct the search for the next Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Mr. Pasquarella thanked the Board for the opportunity to discuss additional changes in wording to the draft document titled, "Michigan Department of Education Search for Superintendent of Public Instruction." He said he hopes to move the document into production next week. He said he did receive comments from some Board members following the August 24, 2000, meeting and has incorporated those suggestions into the document.

There was extensive discussion regarding the draft document including discussions about the Board's role in teacher certification, the diversification of the Michigan economy, decreasing bureaucracy, and increasing flexibility and the Board's desire to be a leader in innovative change. During the discussion Board members suggested a number of changes which Mr. Pasquerella said he would incorporate with the consensus of the Board.

The proposed changes are as follows:

- A. Page 1 - "The State Board's ~~statutory~~ powers ..."
- B. Page 1 , 4th bullet - "...standards, AND PROGRAMS"
- C. Page 2, last paragraph - "...grapple with new tasks. ~~All too frequently public education has been mired in bureaucracy and process, and imprisoned by tradition.~~"
- D. Page 3 - "The budget for the Department, INCLUDING FEDERAL AND

STATE GRANTS ADMINISTERED BY THE DEPARTMENT, is more than \$900 million.”

Mr. Warren moved, seconded by Dr. Moyer, that the State Board of Education approve the document titled, “Michigan Department of Education Search for Superintendent of Public Instruction,” as modified.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

The Board then discussed the need for additional meetings which would focus on the superintendent search. After an extensive discussion, the Board determined that a meeting in executive discussion in late November would be sufficient.

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mrs. Gire, that the State Board of Education convene in Executive Session on Tuesday, November 28, 2000, at 1:00 p.m.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

In response to concerns raised about the “open until filled” designation, Mr. Pasquerella said the benefit of that would be if a viable candidate applied later in the process, the Board would be free to consider the new candidate. He said if a deadline were imposed, and the application was received after that time, the Board could not consider that person for the position. He said he understands the Board’s anxiety regarding this issue because traditionally there are cut off dates. He said in order to avoid that problem, all searches he conducts are considered “open until filled.”

VIII. RECESS

The Board recessed for lunch at 12:03 p.m. and reconvened at 1:00 p.m.

IX. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

- A. Ms. Susan Dingleline, 16250 Northland Drive, Southfield, Michigan 48075. Ms. Dingleline offered comments regarding provisions in the state plan for the disabled and senior citizens in the area of adult basic education, and the impact of the program being moved to the Department of Career Development.

Mr. Tim Kelly, Department of Career Development, said he had spoken with Ms. Dingledine, and recommended that she meet with Dr. Barbara Bolin, Director, Department of Career Development.

Mrs. Beardmore said educational programs operated in other Departments are guided by the State Board of Education.

X. DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING PROCESS FOR SELECTION OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (continued)

Mr. Lee Pasquarella, President, Cascade Consulting Group, Inc., said it is imperative for the Board to address the salary level for the Superintendent's position. He said he is concerned that if the salary is too low, it may deter some viable candidates from applying.

There was extensive discussion regarding the advantages and disadvantages of raising the Superintendent's salary to a level that would attract more candidates, and the manner (i.e., in one or two steps) and size of any increase.

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mrs. Gire, that the salary for the purpose of selecting the new Superintendent of Public Instruction be in the range of \$140,000 to \$160,000.

There was extensive discussion regarding the motion, including desirability of an increase and the size of any such increase.

Mrs. McGuire said the number of staff in the Department of Education has been reduced from approximately 2,000 to 300 employees over the last four years, and therefore, she does not think there is justification to increase the salary for the Superintendent of Public Instruction. She said the Board must also keep in mind that Mr. Pasquarella believes that salary will not be the issue for the new Superintendent, and so she is not in favor of the salary increase.

Mrs. Weiser offered an amendment, seconded by Mrs. Wise, that the salary range for the Superintendent of Public Instruction be \$150,000 to \$165,000.

There was extensive discussion regarding the amendment focused on the need and wisdom for an interim salary raise.

The vote was taken on the amendment.

Ayes: Beardmore, Moyer, Warren, Weiser, Wise

Nays: Gire, McGuire, Straus

The amendment carried.

The vote was taken on the motion, as amended.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

Nay: McGuire

The motion carried.

The Board then discussed the desirability to raise the current superintendent's salary.

Mrs. Beardmore moved, seconded by Mr. Warren, that the State Board of Education increase the salary of the current Superintendent of Public Instruction to \$145,000 effective October 1, 2000.

Several Board members expressed concern that if the Superintendent's salary was not increased it would affect the recruitment efforts and the number of applications received.

Mrs. Gire expressed concern regarding the Board's past personnel practices. She said she has some experience working in local government, and has been involved in the hiring of a city manager and personnel director which required evaluations and salary increases were based on those evaluations. She said she hopes the Board addresses this issue with the hiring of the new superintendent.

Mrs. Gire offered an amendment, seconded by Mrs. Straus, that the salary increase for the current Superintendent of Public Instruction become effective January 1, 2001.

The Board then discussed the desirability and practical issues surrounding an increase of the salary in October as opposed to January. Mr. Scott Jenkins noted that the Governor supported an increase in October.

The vote was taken on the amendment.

Ayes: Gire, Straus

Nays: Beardmore, McGuire, Moyer, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The amendment failed.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Moyer, Warren, Weiser, Wise

Nays: Gire, McGuire, Straus

The motion carried.

XI. RECESS

The Board recessed at 2:10 p.m. and reconvened at 2:30 p.m.

XII. DISCUSSION REGARDING POLICYMAKING ROLE OF THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Dr. Michael Addonizio, Consultant to the State Board of Education, reminded the Board that at its July 20, 2000, meeting, the Board took the following actions:

(1) approved the recreation of a State Board Policy Executive position to be appointed by the new superintendent with the concurrence of the Board; (2) directed the Superintendent to inventory the policies approved by the Board in the last five years, as well as those policies which may have been contained within the statutory provisions transferred in the Executive Order 1996-12 that may go beyond the five year period; and (3) establish a system of procedures for setting policies to meet a variety of situations.

Dr. Addonizio said Mrs. Eileen Hamilton, Administrative Secretary to the State Board of Education, coordinated an extensive effort to review Board meeting minutes and catalogue the items which appeared to be linked to educational policy. He said Mrs. Beardmore, Mrs. Hamilton, and he then evaluated the items and produced the document dated September 15, 2000.

Dr. Addonizio also provided the Board with a suggested process or sequence of events for State Board of Education policymaking which determines how items are brought to the Board's attention, and the subsequent response. He said some of the policymaking activity will be Board initiated, while another part of the cycle will involve the Governor's Office and Legislature.

There was considerable discussion regarding the development of a policy manual and overview document. Board members stated that even though brochures on the Board and Department already exist, it may be beneficial to develop a more in-depth document regarding the role and history of the Board. Much of this information has already been compiled in the superintendent search document so staff would not have to start from ground zero. It was suggested that the manual, once developed, be sent to the Legislature, Executive Office, and local and intermediate school districts as well as posted on the Department's web site.

Mr. Warren moved, seconded by Mrs. Straus, that the State Board of Education

direct the Superintendent and staff to compile a policy manual in the format discussed for review by the State Board of Education.

There was consensus to concentrate first on the policies relating to the Departments of Career Development and Treasury, and that a draft be provided to the Board at the October 19, 2000, meeting.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

Dr. Addonizio said the second matter that was discussed at the July meeting was the policymaking process and operating procedures for the Board. He said the policy making process starts with the State Board of Education's vision for what should be occurring in Michigan's public schools. He said that vision relates to a strategic goal and the Board attempts to create policy to implement the vision of a specific content. He said when issues arise, it should be determined if a relevant policy exists, and if so, it should be reiterated and the administration of the policy would proceed.

Dr. Addonizio said an issue may arise where no policy exists, and a State Board policy is not appropriate. He said it would then be considered a local control issue. However, if it is determined that a state policy is needed, then the State Board would begin its information gathering process to determine what is known about the issue, what type of information is needed, and the desired result.

Dr. Addonizio said as the Board gathers its information, part of that process could involve hearings or other contacts with local and intermediate school districts, parents, and the public. He said in the process of establishing policy, the Board should be provided with alternative proposals, the expected result(s), and potential costs. He said then the Board can decide what action it prefers. He said if the alternatives involve programmatic recommendations, schools should be provided with new programs.

Dr. Addonizio said this builds a process where the Board receives all the necessary information at one meeting, but does not take action until the following month.

It was recommended that the process also include a box which indicates that the policy was implemented. A Board member also suggested the following change to the chart titled, "State Board of Education articulates a vision for Public Education," "Collaboration with ~~MASA, MASB, MSB~~ STAKEHOLDERS, State Legislators..."

Mr. Warren moved, seconded by Dr. Moyer, that the State Board of Education adopt as a model process the sample policy setting procedure, as modified.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

The policy setting process is attached as Exhibit A.

There was discussion regarding the distinction between policy and administration in the Curriculum Standards and Benchmarks. It is clear that setting standards is policy, and the resulting Benchmarks are intended as a guide for understanding the Standards. The Curriculum Frameworks were created to assist local school districts to align curriculum with the Standards. A question was raised whether the Benchmarks should be considered part of the policy, and what impact the curriculum staff in the Department of Career Development will have on the process. In response, Dr. Michael Williamson, Deputy Director, Education Services, said Michigan uses the terms Standards and Benchmarks, however, other states refer to content standards and performance standards. He said content standards would be what students should know upon completion of each grade. He said the Frameworks are a set of standards and supporting benchmarks which guide school districts.

There was considerable discussion regarding whether Benchmarks are policy, and it was agreed that this was a complex issue. It was suggested that staff present information, and provide the Curriculum Standards and Benchmarks to the Board for review.

Mr. Ellis reminded the Board that it has been mentioned that staff intend to continually update the Standards as opposed to trying to do it all at once.

There was consensus to postpone further discussion until the October 19, 2000 meeting.

XII. REPORT ON CONSENT AGENDA

- C. Approval of Criteria for the 2000-2002 Innovative Program Demonstration Grants
- D. Approval of Criteria for the 2000-2001 Innovative Curriculum Development Grant Program
- E. Approval of Criteria for the 2000-2001 All Students Achieve Program Literacy Achievement Program Grants (ASAP-LAP)
- F. Approval of Criteria for Grants to Support Personnel Development for Serving Students with Autism

- G. Approval of Criteria for a Grant for State Improvement Activities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
- H. Receive the Report of the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Specialty-Area Conferences for Grand Valley State University, Siena Heights University and Western Michigan University and Approve the Specialty Studies Programs
- I. Approval of Proposal from Lake Superior State University for a New Business Education Program as a Group Major at the Secondary Level
- R. Approval of Criteria for the Selection of Demonstration Sites for Early Intervention/Early Childhood Practices under Parts B and C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Mrs. Gire moved, seconded by Mr. Warren, that the State Board of Education approve the items listed on the consent agenda as follows:

- C. approve the criteria for the 2000-2002 Innovative Program Demonstration Grants as described in the Superintendent's memorandum dated September 15, 2000;**
- D. approve the criteria for the 2000-2001 Innovative Curriculum Development Program as described in the Superintendent's memorandum dated September 15, 2000;**
- E. approve the criteria for the 2000-2001 All Students Achieve Program Literacy Achievement Program Grants (ASAP-LAP) as described in the Superintendent's memorandum dated September 6, 2000;**
- F. approve criteria for grants to support personnel development for serving students with autism as identified in the Superintendent's memorandum dated September 15, 2000;**
- G. approve criteria for a grant to support state improvement activities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) as identified in the Superintendent's memorandum dated September 15, 2000;**
- H. (1) approve the Grand Valley State University biology, physics, history, political science, psychology, sociology, and social studies programs for five years (2000-2005); (2) approve the Siena Heights University mathematics, English, reading, reading specialist, history, and chemistry programs for five years (2000-2005); (3) approve the Western Michigan University mathematics (secondary major) program for five years (2000-**

2005); (4) grant pending approval to the Grand Valley State University mathematics, English, reading, chemistry, earth science, economics, and geography programs for two years (2000-2002); (5) grant pending approval to the Siena Heights University language arts, biology, and general science programs for two years (2000-2002); and (6) grant pending approval to the Western Michigan University mathematics (elementary), mathematics (secondary minor), biology, and political science programs for two years (2000-2002), as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated September 15, 2000;

- I. approve the proposal for a new Business Education program as a group major at the secondary level, submitted by Lake Superior State University, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated September 15, 2000; and
- R. approve criteria for the selection of demonstration sites for early intervention/early childhood practices as identified in the Superintendent's memorandum dated September 15, 2000.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

XIII. REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

- J. Human Resources Report
- K. Report on Administrative Rule Waivers
- L. Report on Property Transfers
- M. Report on a Modification to the Previously Approved Genesee Intermediate School District Plan for the Delivery of Special Education Programs and Services
- N. Title I Schoolwide Program Planning Grants
- O. 1999-2000 Learn and Serve Michigan Program
- P. 1999-2000 Federally-Funded Child Care and Development Fund Grants for School-Age Child Care
- Q. 2000-2001 Goals 2000 Cycle 11/Category Three

- S. 1999-2000 Goals 2000 Cycle 9/Category One Amendment

XIV. COMMENTS BY STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS

- A. Full Day, Full Service Schools Assembly - Mrs. Kathleen Straus

Mrs. Straus said the Full Day, Full Service Schools Assembly has met regularly over the last several months and has addressed many issues including child care programs provided by school districts. She said this issue was brought to the attention of the Assembly by staff of the Department of Consumer and Industry Services (CIS) which licenses the programs, and the Family Independence Agency (FIA) which regulates the facilities. She said many of the school districts which want to provide child care programs do so through community education programs. MRS. STRAUS said some local school districts have approached their legislators, and as a result Senator William Van Regenmorter introduced Senate Bill 1317, to modify those requirements and exempt school districts from certain regulations.

Mrs. Straus said members of the Full Day, Full Service Schools Assembly, who represent other state departments, school districts, private organizations, as well as Michigan Department of Education staff, felt that SB 1317 was too open, and therefore, have proposed an amendment. She said the Assembly is requesting that the State Board of Education support the bill with amendments, and she is bringing the issue before the Board now because Senator Van Regenmorter intends to address it when the Senate reconvenes.

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mrs. McGuire, that the State Board of Education support Senate Bill 1317 with the amendments suggested by the Full Day, Full Service Schools Assembly.

Mr. Ellis said this is a sensitive bill that may cause problems for schools without child care programs if any of the wording is changed.

Mrs. Straus said the Assembly does not want to remove CIS licensing authority because licensing is required to qualify for Medicaid. She said the proposed amendments were negotiated with many different agencies, and the FIA, CIS, Community Health, and staff at the Department of Education all agree that the proposed changes are needed.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser
Absent: Wise

The motion carried.

B. Oakland Schools - Mrs. Dorothy Beardmore

Mrs. Beardmore distributed a copy of “Their Future is in Our Hands” to the Board. She said the document was developed through a joint venture between Oakland Schools, and the Oakland County Board of Commissioners. She said it is intended as a guide for families, and she felt the Board should receive a copy because of recent discussion regarding brain research and early childhood development.

C. The National Association of State Boards of Education Legislative Update -
Dr. Herbert Moyer

Dr. Moyer read an excerpt from a recent National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) Legislative Update titled, “Voc Ed Prompts Standoff Between Department and Michigan Governor,” which read, “The Department of Education’s Office of Vocational Education is balking at approving Michigan’s Vocational Education State Plan and thus releasing federal funds to the state because of a dispute over a government issue related to this state board. Last year, Governor Engler signed an Executive Order shifting authority over vocational education from the State Board of Education to a new Department of Career Development, however, the federal Voc Ed law clearly requires that a State Board administer these federal funds, and federal officials contend that the new state Department does not constitute a board. In addition, these same officials say that such a transfer of authority requires a change in state law, not just an Executive Order. Governor Engler’s office maintains that the law the new Department is overseen by qualifies as a Board, and that the Executive Order has the force of law in the state.”

Dr. Moyer requested additional information on the issue since he was not aware of the problem.

Mr. Ellis said the State Plan assumes that the approving authority is the State Board of Education, however, the Governor’s Office and the Department of

Career Development suggest that the Workforce Development Board is the board of authority. He said Mr. Tim Kelly, Department of Career Development, stated that Governor Engler, and Secretary Richard Riley have personally discussed this issue, and the United States Department of Education (USDOE) will reveal the results of that conversation soon.

Mr. Kelly felt that the USDOE will more than likely release the money and then determine if the Workforce Development Board is the legitimate board according to the law.

XV. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Board members were asked to submit agenda items for the October meeting to the Administrative Secretary. Mr. Ellis said Department staff, the Board President, and Vice President would be meeting within the next couple of weeks to develop and finalize the agenda.

XVI. FUTURE MEETING DATES

- A. October 19, 2000
- B. November 16, 2000
- C. November 28, 2000 (Executive Session)
- D. December 14, 2000

XVII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Herbert S. Moyer
Secretary